

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

BOROUGH OF EDGEWATER, .
Plaintiff, .
vs. . Case No. 14-cv-05060
WATERSIDE CONSTRUCTION, LLC, . Newark, New Jersey
et al., . February 17, 2017
Defendants. .

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING
BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES B. CLARK, III
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff: TIMOTHY E. CORRISTON, ESQ.
Connell Foley, LLP
85 Livingston Avenue
Roseland, NJ 07068-1765
(973) 535-0500
tcorriston@connellfoley.com

NICOLE BIANCA DORY, ESQ.
Connell Foley LLP
85 Livingston Avenue
Roseland, NJ 07068
(973) 535-0500
ndory@connellfoley.com

Audio Operator:

Transcription Service: KING TRANSCRIPTION SERVICES
3 South Corporate Drive, Suite 203
Riverdale, NJ 07457
(973) 237-6080

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording (not all parties were discernible on the record); transcript produced by transcription service.

1 (APPEARANCES continued)

2
3 For the Defendants JASON T. SHAFRON, ESQ.
Waterside Shafron Law Group, LLC
Construction, 38 2 University Plaza, Suite 400
4 COAH LLC, Daibes Hackensack, NJ 07601
Brothers Inc., and (201) 343-7200
5 North River Mews, jshafron@shafronlaw.com
and Fred Daibes:

6 ZACHARY BERNSTEIN, ESQ.
7 Shafron Law Group, LLC
2 University Plaza, Suite 400
Hackensack, NJ 07601
8 (201) 343-7200
Zbernstein@shafronlaw.com

9
10 For the Alcoa MICHAEL E. WALLER, ESQ.
Defendants: K&L Gates LLP
One Newark Center, 10th Floor
11 Newark, NJ 07102
12 (973) 848-4000
michael.waller@klgates.com

13
14 DANA B. PARKER, ESQ.
K&L Gates LLP
One Newark Center, 10th Floor
15 Newark, NJ 07102
16 (973) 848-4091
dana.parker@klgates.com

17
18 For the Defendant DAVID R. PIERCE, ESQ.
Terms Environmental Lindabury, McCormick & Estabrook, PC
Services, Inc.: 53 Cardinal Drive
PO Box 2369
19 Westfield, NJ 07091-2369
20 (908) 233-6800
dpierce@lindabury.com

21
22 For the Third-Party ROBERT PANSULLA, ESQ.
Defendant County of Finazzo Cossolini O'Leary Meola &
Bergen: Hager
67 East Park Place, Suite 901
23 Morristown, NJ 07960
24 (973) 343-4960
25 robert.pansulla@finazzolaw.com

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

3

1 | (Commencement of proceedings at 3:09 P.M.)

2 |
3 | THE COURT: We are on the record in Borough of
4 | Edgewater versus Waterside Construction LLC, et al. That's
5 | Docket Entry -- Civil Action Number 14-5060 (JMV). It is
6 | about 8 minutes after 3 in the noon on February 17th, 2017.

7 | I guess starting with the plaintiffs, can we enter
8 | our appearances.

9 | MR. CORRISTON: Yes, Your Honor, good afternoon.
10 | Timothy Corrison from Connell Foley for the plaintiff
11 | Edgewater, Borough of Edgewater.

12 | MS. DORY: Nicole Dory, Connell Foley also for the
13 | Borough.

14 | THE COURT: Good afternoon.

15 | MS. PARKER: Dana Parker, K&L Gates, on behalf of
16 | Alcoa Domestic and Alcoa Corp.

17 | MR. WALLER: Michael Waller of K&L Gates for Alcoa
18 | and Alcoa Domestic.

19 | MR. BERNSTEIN: Zachary Bernstein with Shafron Law
20 | Group for the Waterside defendants, Waterside Construction,
21 | 38 COAH LLC, Daibes Brothers Inc., North River Mews
22 | Associates, LLC, Fred Daibes, and third-party River Road --

23 | MR. SHAFRON: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Jason
24 | Shafron from Shafron Law Group also for the Waterside
25 | defendants.

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

4

1 MR. PIERCE: Good afternoon, Your Honor, David
2 Pierce, Lindabury, McCormick, Estabrook & Cooper representing
3 defendant Terms Environmental Services Inc.

4 MR. OLIVER: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Peter
5 Oliver from Hoagland Longo representing third-party defendant
6 Neglia Engineering Associates.

7 MR. PANSULLA: Good afternoon, Judge, Robert
8 Pansulla, Finazzo Cossolini O'Leary Meola & Hager for the
9 third-party defendant County of Bergen.

10 THE COURT: Okay. Good afternoon to all of you.

11 Look, I start out with an observation. Since the
12 middle of January, I have 10 letters in this case. I -- if I
13 were to get 10 letters in all 600 cases that I have, I'd have
14 6,000 letters a month. I'd have to read 200 a day just to
15 keep up.

16 I don't know what to say to that. I -- you know, I
17 understand that this case is contentious, that we don't sort
18 of really agree on anything, but I really -- the sign that
19 things are breaking down and people aren't cooperating is
20 usually when I get dozens and dozens of letter in a case. I
21 really would hope and urge and wish that you all would start
22 to cooperate and get things done in a timely fashion. I
23 don't know -- maybe that's idle hope, but that I open with
24 that observation, and, you know, having said that, I will try
25 to tackle the things that we have raised for today -- for the

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

5

1 conference today.

2 I see -- when I sift through my notes in the 10
3 letters, I see kind of four issues that we have to deal with.
4 They all seem to deal with plaintiff Alcoa or the Daibes --
5 I'll refer to them as the Daibes defendants. I -- you folks
6 on the side, if you -- our last three, if you have things to
7 say or things to raise, we'll give you a chance at the end,
8 but otherwise, enjoy the show, I guess, is what I would say
9 for all of you.

10 The first issue is between Alcoa and the Daibes
11 defendants. And I'll try to deal with each one at a time so
12 that we don't get bogged down or confused or tripping over
13 one another.

14 And the first issue, we focus on an Alcoa letter
15 that's dated January 11th, 2017, and that is Document 196 on
16 the docket. And then a Daibes letter in response, dated
17 January 26th, 2017; that's Document Number 208 on the docket.

18 Now, Alcoa says that the Daibes defendants have not
19 produced tax returns and financial statements from 1987 to
20 the present and that they raised for the first time in --
21 facts or the allegation that many of the things that they
22 would produce were destroyed in the Sandy storm back in 2012.

23 Alcoa in its letter, also makes some specific
24 requests, given that it hasn't gotten a number -- or claims
25 that it hasn't gotten a number of things from the Daibes

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

6

1 defendants, suggests that I order a list of things that come
2 at the end of that letter.

3 In the responsive letter, counsel for Daibes says
4 that, well, we've had conversations, and I've produced what I
5 can produce. I'm trying to get the tax returns from the IRS
6 and from New Jersey, but that will take six to eight weeks to
7 do. And counsel for the Daibes defendants suggests that
8 these requests for loan and credit line and insurance and
9 bond and refinancing applications is new and that they don't
10 want to -- that they don't want to produce that.

11 Now, I do know the financial statements were part
12 of what you were supposed to produce, and, you know, I don't
13 know, based on these short letters, how complete or
14 incomplete the production was.

15 But let me turn -- who's going to speak for okay?
16 Mr. Waller or Ms. Parker?

17 MS. PARKER: Ms. Parker. I will.

18 THE COURT: Ms. Parker, okay.

19 MS. PARKER: So to --

20 THE COURT: This is our first issue to tackle. So
21 tell me -- tell me what we know now. These letters are
22 almost month old.

23 MS. PARKER: Absolutely. Well, not much has
24 changed since we wrote the letters.

25 Before I wrote this letter -- and I'll tell you

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

7

1 asked exactly what was produced so it might give a sense of
2 sort of where we are. No financial statements were produced.
3 No K-1 statements at all were produced. We did receive a
4 handful of returns for some but not all of the Daibes
5 defendant corporate entities for spanning a period of three
6 or four years. But, you know, notably what was missing were
7 the earlier returns and also some returns were not even
8 produced of any the corporate entities.

9 So we have a problem here. And no financials,
10 correct.

11 So we have a problem here, because, you know, I
12 think we've already articulated to Your Honor the relevancy
13 of these requests as it goes and as it relates to our
14 potential indemnity and defense obligations that they owe to
15 us. And being able to see the financial wherewithal of these
16 companies is significant in terms of some of the arguments
17 that we need to be able to make down the road.

18 THE COURT: Well, and I think we've been through --

19 MS. PARKER: Yeah.

20 THE COURT: -- the relevance and that things need
21 to be produced.

22 Mr. Shafron, what am I supposed to do at this
23 point?

24 MR. SHAFRON: Your Honor, thank you. As you
25 recall -- and one of the -- by the way, the reasons there's

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

8

1 10 letters, I think is because every time a letter is
2 written, then a responding letter needs to be written, and
3 then a reply letter to the responding letter needs to get
4 written.

5 And you might or might not have been aware of the
6 dispute that had arisen after we were before you the last
7 time about the terms of the order. And we were of the
8 impression when we left here that it would be -- because
9 that's what we were talking about -- it would approximately
10 six years of tax returns. And then when we saw the draft
11 order, it talks about returns all the way back to 1997.

12 So once we -- once the order was signed indicating
13 that we had to do tax returns back to 1997, then we
14 endeavored to get them. And that's when we found out where
15 we stand with returns.

16 And one of the reasons there's a confusion about
17 the returns is some of these entities don't exist anymore.
18 That's why there are no recent returns. It's not like these
19 recent returns for these entities are being withheld. There
20 weren't any tax returns for some of these entities. It would
21 only be back in the 1997, you know, 2000, 2005 period, that's
22 the only time that there would be any returns, and we don't
23 have those.

24 So we took Ms. Parker's suggestion -- well, we
25 didn't agree to that list that she had suggested to

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

9

1 Your Honor about what additional information, but the point
2 was well-taken that the returns that we don't have and we
3 checked with our accountant and with the Daibes entities, and
4 what we produced is all that we have possession of.

5 But Ms. Parker's suggestion in her letter that,
6 well, you can request these from the IRS, so --

7 THE COURT: So you --

8 MR. SHAFRON: -- we've done it. We've had our --
9 the company's accountant send those in for all of those
10 returns that have been requested. All of the returns that we
11 don't have, we've sent to the IRS, and there's a fee for
12 that, and I guess that's bigger than I thought, but we've
13 done that, so to get those records. And they told us --

14 THE COURT: And you'll do that as soon as you can.

15 MR. SHAFRON: And we did that already. It was
16 done -- when was it --

17 THE COURT: Well, you haven't received the returns.

18 MR. SHAFRON: Well, we haven't received them. As
19 soon as they're received, they're going to be -- that they're
20 going to be marked confidential, and they're going to be
21 produced.

22 And that, I can tell you because I was there when
23 it was done.

24 THE COURT: And, Ms. Parker, what's --

25 MS. PARKER: Well, I guess the first thing is we

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

10

1 haven't seen that request directly that was made to the IRS,
2 so we don't know the scope in terms of the years that they
3 requested. And we also don't know if they made those
4 requests to just the federal as well the state IRS.

5 And additionally, just a point that we wanted to
6 make is that, you know, this is the first time that we've
7 heard that some of these entities no longer exist. They're
8 citing pleadings. They're responding to discovery on behalf
9 of all of these corporate entities. And now all of a sudden
10 on the record we're hearing that they don't exist. How is
11 that -- how do we square that?

12 MALE SPEAKER: How do I square that?

13 MS. PARKER: Or, I mean, I'm just trying to
14 understand his position that you're say --

15 MR. SHAFRON: Tax returns -- I know that tax
16 returns certainly were not filed for those entities -- for
17 some of these entities. So tax returns were not filed for
18 some of these entities. Like, I know, I'm sure tax returns,
19 for example, was not filed for Daibes Brothers. I'm sure
20 there were no -- what's that? And River Road Improvement,
21 certainly.

22 So I mean, some of these entities that there are no
23 tax returns because they don't file tax returns. Whether or
24 not they still exist as to the legal entity, I don't know,
25 but there's no tax returns have been filed for Daibes

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

11

1 Brothers. RRIP I know --

2 THE COURT: Are you seeking the state and the
3 federal returns?

4 MR. SHAFRON: I -- you know what? That's an
5 excellent question. Can you call?

6 I know that we requested the federal. I don't know
7 if we requested the state returns.

8 THE COURT: Ms. Parker, do we need the state
9 returns?

10 MS. PARKER: It would be helpful.

11 THE COURT: Because?

12 MS. PARKER: If it shows some -- you know, a
13 discrepancy. I'm assuming that they're consistent. But, you
14 know, I am not a tax expert to be able to know -- to be able
15 to -- without showing it to an expert.

16 THE COURT: Well, I think the contemplation was it
17 was going to be the state and the federal tax turns.

18 MR. SHAFRON: I will -- I will confirm, Your Honor.
19 And if we have not requested from the state -- for the state
20 returns for these entities, we will do so immediately.

21 THE COURT: All right. Well, there shouldn't be
22 any -- there shouldn't be any ongoing confusion about those.
23 You're going to produce the federal returns. You're going to
24 produce the state returns that you have for the given years.
25 And you're going to --

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

12

1 MR. SHAFRON: We have.

2 THE COURT: And you're going to request the ones
3 that you don't have from those two governing entities.

4 MR. SHAFRON: And I want the record --

5 THE COURT: This may be the only thing we tackle
6 today that's pretty cut-and-dried. They want that done, and
7 they want it done as quickly as we can do it.

8 MR. SHAFRON: Yes, and -- but I want the record to
9 be clear that all of the returns, and of course there are --
10 with Your Honor's order that we are in possession -- or our
11 accountant was in possession of, have been produced. So now
12 we're talking about the ones that were not in our possession
13 that we are endeavoring to obtain pursuant to Alcoa's
14 suggestion.

15 THE COURT: Yeah, I've been unhappy -- I've been
16 unhappy at the speed of production in this case in many
17 instances. But at least with this, I do understand if they
18 don't have the returns and they're making efforts to go to
19 the IRS and to the state, they're not -- we'll get them when
20 we get them, and hopefully that will be sooner rather than
21 later, but they don't have any control over that, and I would
22 just ask you to use all --

23 MR. SHAFRON: And we will.

24 (Simultaneous conversation)

25 THE COURT: You haven't asked for the state.

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

13

1 MR. SHAFRON: We haven't asked for those --

2 THE COURT: I don't want to hear two months from
3 now --

4 MR. SHAFRON: That we haven't asked.

5 THE COURT: -- Ms. Parker standing up and saying,
6 geez, they still haven't asked for the state stuff.
7 That's -- yeah.

8 MS. PARKER: Just two things that I wanted to add.
9 They -- that doesn't address the fact that they still have
10 not given us any financial statements or K-1s.

11 THE COURT: That's step two.

12 MS. PARKER: And then the -- the other thing I
13 wanted to say is that we'd like to be copied on their
14 requests to the IRS, because we don't know exactly the scope
15 of what they're requesting. And based on the history of
16 what's gone on, we're not very confident that they're
17 actually seeking what we're asking them for specifically in
18 terms of going back to 1997. So we'd like to know now that
19 those requests are actually accurate and reflect Your Honor's
20 ruling and not another three months from now.

21 THE COURT: Mr. Shafron, can you provide whatever
22 you send to the governing agency -- it's only going to serve
23 to make things smoother in the long run. I really don't
24 relish the thought that you've gone after X and Alcoa thinks
25 you should have gone after Y, and we waste another couple of

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

14

1 months.

2 MS. PARKER: And you can obviously redact the
3 confidential --

4 MR. SHAFRON: Yeah, yeah, okay, so --

5 THE COURT: Just so they know what it is you're
6 requesting.

7 MR. SHAFRON: Yes, we should be able to produce it.

8 MS. PARKER: Correct.

9 THE COURT: And that way we're on the same page and
10 that becomes a nonissue.

11 All right. The second half of that, the financial
12 documents that you have here. What exactly -- what can we do
13 to satisfy that request. I mean this -- I said the tax
14 returns is easy, because it's a certain number of years,
15 there's a certain number of entities. This is a little
16 harder. You know, I have two short letters. I don't know
17 exactly what it is we want regarding financials. And I don't
18 know what it is you're entitled to. We've made requests
19 before. Mr. Shafron's letter says you're making new requests
20 now, things that -- you know, I think I went through the
21 list, requests for loan, credit line, insurance, bond and
22 refinancing applications. He suggests that's a new request.

23 What is it we're looking for?

24 MS. PARKER: The financial statements would be, in
25 our mind, would be backup that are used to generate the tax

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

15

1 returns. So what we're trying to get a sense of is their
2 capitalization throughout the years.

3 We have -- we don't have anything. So for us to
4 say -- you know, we're trying -- in our suggested order to
5 Your Honor, we're trying to get ahold of their financial
6 strength. So we -- and we have nothing to work with to even
7 know if we have one document, if it's suitable.

8 THE COURT: Right. And I appreciate your need to
9 do that. I just want to do it in as streamlined and easy a
10 way as possible so that we are not here again and again and
11 again, fighting over, you know, the edges of production and
12 saying I need more or I haven't been given something that I'm
13 entitled to.

14 MS. PARKER: But normally, my understanding is is
15 that when a corporate entity files a tax return, they have to
16 provide the accountant with a balance sheet, profit-loss
17 statements, et cetera, for each year. And then the
18 accountant uses that information to generate the returns.

19 So that at a minimum would be something that would
20 probably satisfy our requests.

21 THE COURT: Okay. Say that again.

22 MS. PARKER: A balance sheet of the company's
23 assets and liabilities. And any other potential backup
24 documents that they provided to the accountant.

25 THE COURT: All right. Now for each of these

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

16

1 entities and each of those years -- well, I know the answer
2 on some of them is going to be the same. They're gone the
3 same way that the tax returns were gone. And, here, you
4 can't go to the IRS to ask for the backup documents. Right?

5 MR. SHAFRON: Well, one of -- yes, Your Honor. And
6 one of the -- and this is -- and this could very well be my
7 fault, but one of the -- because it wasn't in writing. But
8 one of the reasons that we didn't argue the motions on this
9 subject matter was we had originally indicated to the Alcoa
10 defendants that this information wasn't available.

11 So what we said was we'll produce the tax returns,
12 because we don't have this financial information -- so we'll
13 produce the last few years of tax returns. And maybe I'm
14 confused as to what it is that this is relevant to. It
15 sounds like what Ms. Parker's saying it's relevant to is
16 collection of any cross-claim debt, if there were ever to be
17 any, that seems to be what Ms. Parker's suggesting --

18 MS. PARKER: No.

19 MR. SHAFRON: -- that the relevancy of these
20 documents are.

21 And if that's the case, I don't see how any of
22 these other documents, other than current documents, are
23 relevant.

24 MS. PARKER: No, it actually has to do with our
25 veil-piercing argument in the sense that all these

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

17

1 corporate -- it's our understanding that a lot of these
2 corporate entities are the alter ego of the individual,
3 Mr. Daibes. And if there are defense indemnity obligations
4 that some of the corporations have, but not all -- and
5 Mr. Daibes is really the alter ego of these companies, we're
6 entitled to know the capitalization of them in the event that
7 we have to pierce the corporate veil.

8 MR. SHAFRON: Even if that were the theory and that
9 was an acceptable theory of why these documents would be
10 relevant, even then, I don't see how 1997 and 2005 documents
11 are relevant to whether these entities are -- I don't know
12 what the question is -- undercapitalized, I don't know what
13 the theory is as to how it is that these are alter egos from
14 each other if they're separate corporate entities.

15 But whatever that theory is, I don't -- then I
16 don't see at all -- which is why I was surprised that
17 suddenly 1997 documents were relevant to this inquiry.

18 MS. PARKER: Well, the transaction at issue
19 occurred in 1997. And then there was some subsequent
20 activity in the early 2000s that make that time period
21 relevant. So that's why we're -- we're not doing it just for
22 fun. There's a reason why we're going back to 1997.

23 THE COURT: Yeah, and --

24 MS. PARKER: Down that road.

25 THE COURT: Down this road, Mr. Shafron.

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

18

1 MR. SHAFRON: So with that said, so the issue is
2 are there other documents produced? We're told that there
3 aren't.

4 Now, I am told --

5 THE COURT: You've got to look and you've got to
6 represent that you have them or you don't have them. And if
7 you have them, you've got to produce them. All right?

8 MR. SHAFRON: So we have not stated in writing that
9 some of these documents which I know we don't have, but we'll
10 do that. We'll say in writing that we do not have those
11 documents.

12 And some of this information by the way -- and what
13 Your Honor indicated earlier to some of these issues -- for
14 example, we started the deposition this week of a project
15 manager for this project for my client. And he was able to
16 answer some of the questions, some of the questions that
17 Edgewater had about some of the concerns that we had.

18 I'm sure that is going to be the case, and if
19 eventually the principal of some of these entities is going
20 to be deposed, they will have most of this information, and
21 to the extent that there is additional information that I'm
22 not able to obtain for some reason, I'm sure that they'll --
23 these questions will get answered.

24 And then if there are more documents that are
25 identified -- which I would be surprised, because I don't

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

19

1 have them, but if there were more documents would be
2 identified, they'll be identified at the deposition, I'm
3 quite sure.

4 THE COURT: Well, I think that for Ms. Parker's
5 request, she's narrowed it to the balance sheet and the
6 backup documents that were provided to prepare the tax
7 returns. To the extent you have them for at the entities
8 beginning in 1997, you need to produce them. I think
9 we've -- by doing that, we've fairly narrowed this. You're
10 going to be obligated to give them something, if you have it,
11 that will help them figure out the things that she has
12 already explained that they need to figure out. If you don't
13 have them, you can't produce what you don't have, but you
14 need to represent to them, you know --

15 MR. SHAFRON: And that, we can do, Your Honor. And
16 I know there's one financial statement that I do know exists
17 that we can produce. But the remaining, we don't have them.
18 So we'll either represent in writing that we don't have them,
19 which I think is most of them, and to the extent we have one,
20 we will provide that.

21 THE COURT: All right.

22 MR. SHAFRON: But not -- but we don't agree to
23 produce this other information, loan documents and credit
24 line --

25 THE COURT: As of right now, I think we've agreed

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

20

1 | that we can go to the balance sheets and the backup
2 | documents. I don't want to get -- I don't want this thing to
3 | become so unwieldy that we bog down on this for months and
4 | months and months. I think what we're -- what we focused on
5 | right now is fair. I think that takes care of the first
6 | issue, the tax returns and the backup or the financial
7 | documents.

8 | MS. PARKER: I'm sorry, Your Honor. He didn't talk
9 | about the K-1s.

10 | THE COURT: The K-1s?

11 | MS. PARKER: The members of each of the corporate
12 | entities.

13 | THE COURT: Let me see. I think --

14 | MS. PARKER: They're in your December 2006 order.
15 | (Pause in proceedings)

16 | THE COURT: All right. Well, refresh my
17 | recollection, Ms. Parker.

18 | MS. PARKER: You had also ordered that they produce
19 | K-1s of the Daibes corporate entities.

20 | THE COURT: Right.

21 | MS. PARKER: And we haven't received any of
22 | those --

23 | THE COURT: You're right. Okay.

24 | So, Mr. Shafron, how about that?

25 | MR. BERNSTEIN: I believe -- I am not certain, but

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

21

1 I believe some of the K-1s are actually with -- in the tax
2 returns that were produced from the corporate entity. There
3 should be K-1 information. But I don't know if we have
4 any -- have actual separate K-1s from any of the members
5 themselves.

6 THE COURT: Well, do you all -- I mean it doesn't
7 sound like you dispute that you need to produce things.
8 Right?

9 MR. BERNSTEIN: Not to the extent that we haven't,
10 but we will -- had produced them, I believe.

11 THE COURT: Ms. Parker?

12 MS. PARKER: Sure, but to the extent that likewise
13 they are obtainable through the IRS, we'd like them as well.
14 I mean, it should be in the same category as the tax returns.

15 THE COURT: I agree. This should be within the tax
16 returns.

17 MR. SHAFRON: That's my understanding is that the
18 tax returns themselves contain the companies' K-1s.

19 THE COURT: Maybe that's my problem. I think I
20 just conflated them with the tax returns.

21 MR. SHAFRON: To the extent that -- and what --
22 here's what I'll do. I'll go back and this goes to
23 Ms. Parker's point about what was requested. And I will find
24 out -- and we're going to send to Ms. Parker with the
25 requests that we sent to the IRS, and what -- we'll find out

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

22

1 from the IRS when we request the return what comes with that
2 return. And I assume that K-1s that were filed with the
3 return are --

4 MS. PARKER: It's my understanding -- and I'm not a
5 tax expert, but it's my understanding an individual members
6 of a certain -- of a corporation with the ones who receive
7 the K-1s from the corporate entity, and those -- the
8 individuals, for instance, Mr. Daibes, would have a separate
9 K-1 form that he would then file in connection with his
10 personal returns.

11 MR. SHAFRON: That's a hundred percent right.

12 MS. PARKER: Okay. So that's what we're looking
13 for. So I don't -- we don't need to rely on the corporate
14 entities' returns for the K-1 information. You should be
15 looking to the individuals to give you the K-1s.

16 MR. SHAFRON: And -- produced, to the extent we --
17 and, right. That's what we produced, the personal returns
18 that we have, we've produced. So that's the --

19 MS. PARKER: But there's no K-1 in there. That's
20 what I'm saying. It's says you produced his returns, but
21 there's a separate document, which is a K-1 document, which I
22 didn't see, unless I missed it.

23 MR. SHAFRON: Oh, all right. And Ms. Parker's
24 correct about this. If there was a return produced, it
25 should have -- it should have a K-1 with it. Normally, if

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

23

1 you are an LLC member, you should have a K-1 with it. I
2 would have assumed it was with the return.

3 It certainly wasn't --

4 (Simultaneous conversation)

5 MR. SHAFRON: It certainly wasn't purposely
6 withheld.

7 THE COURT: You know where I stand. I mean, you
8 should produce these things.

9 MR. SHAFRON: Yes, that --

10 THE COURT: And Ms. Parker's entitled to them. So
11 let's get it done, and let's get it done as quickly as we
12 can.

13 MR. SHAFRON: That -- that I will. To the extent
14 returns were produced, I would have assumed that K-1s were
15 with them.

16 THE COURT: All right. So we'll check -- you'll
17 have a meet-and-confer with Ms. Parker. Between the two of
18 you, you'll check whether there are K-1s with the returns
19 that have already been produced. If there aren't, they need
20 to be produced. And hopefully you're going to get something
21 with the returns that we're going to get from the government
22 through your requests. Right?

23 MS. PARKER: Thank you, Your Honor.

24 THE COURT: All right? All right. I think that
25 takes care of issue number one or the first group of letters.

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

24

1 Second group of letters includes a letter from the
2 plaintiff. That's Document 206. It's dated January 26th,
3 2017. A letter from the Daibes defendants, dated
4 February 3rd, 2017. That's Document 212. And a letter from
5 the plaintiff dated February 8th, 2017. That is
6 Document 2014.

7 Here, the plaintiff say -- alleges a number of
8 things. First, that the plaintiff -- that the Daibes
9 defendants have not adequately responded to requests for
10 admissions that were propounded upon them.

11 Second thing that the plaintiff alleges is that the
12 Daibes defendants have not provided the names and full
13 contact information for people who were involved in that
14 period of that the fill was moved in this case.

15 The third thing that the plaintiffs allege is that
16 the Daibes defendants have not provided the name and contact
17 information for a fellow named Pilo, who was apparently
18 somebody kind of -- requests seems to be a subset of
19 Request 2, quite frankly.

20 And number four, the plaintiff says that the Daibes
21 defendants have not provided the payroll records for the
22 people who were involved in the fill-moving operation, that
23 only one week of pay records have been produced and that they
24 were looking for pay records for a substantial period of time
25 in 2013.

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

25

1 Now, all of this is obviously highly relevant. It
2 just goes to the heart of what's going on.

3 So -- and in the Daibes defendants' response,
4 they -- they say they located the answers to -- or to the
5 requests to admit, they've provided the identity of the
6 people who worked at the field, including Porfrio Manuel, I
7 guess it is, who is Pilo, and will produce them all for
8 depositions. And they say they've also produced some payroll
9 records, but I think in the follow-up letter, the
10 plaintiff -- that is when the plaintiff complains it's only
11 payroll records for a week.

12 Again, Mr. Corriston or Ms. Dory, who's going to
13 speak?

14 MS. DORY: I'll speak, Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: All right. So those aren't complicated
16 requests, I don't -- maybe the requests for admissions. I
17 don't know, you know, the specifics on that. But where do we
18 stand with all this?

19 MS. DORY: Okay. So I'll start with the requests
20 to admit. You know, they did improve some of responses to
21 the requests to admit. But there's still about 15 or so
22 among the various entities that we're not getting an
23 appropriate response. You know, we asked one thing and
24 they're admitting something else.

25 And these are facts that are pretty critical to the

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

26

1 issues in this litigation.

2 So we'd like to have -- we'd like to present those
3 to Your Honor, and, you know, based upon their responses,
4 have those deemed admitted for their failure to provide an
5 adequate response.

6 THE COURT: Mr. Shafron? What seems to be the
7 problem? I'm generally loathe to have situations where we
8 deem to admit because -- where we deem they're admitted
9 because there's -- there's a dispute about the adequacy of
10 the answers. It's one thing if people just completely blow
11 them off and don't really care about answering at all. But
12 sounds like you've at least had a response here.

13 So have you had a meet-and-confer, Mr. Shafron, on
14 these 15 or so requests to admit?

15 MR. SHAFRON: Not -- well, we have -- well,
16 certainly through the letter writing, I guess you can
17 consider that a meet-and-confer.

18 As to the remaining 15 or so, I guess we haven't
19 had a recent meet-and-confer on that issue. And we didn't --
20 and, again, the history here is -- our position was the
21 requests for admission that were recently served were fully
22 answered. Not -- and I believe that was by a prior firm that
23 was representing the Waterside defendants.

24 Then more specific requests were asked for, and
25 then we -- my firm answered -- gave more specific answers,

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

27

1 which they're still not satisfied.

2 Then it was presented to Your Honor a third round,
3 and we had a very difficult time because we had answered them
4 to the best of our ability, but we still met with other
5 representatives of the entities to see if we could get more
6 specific answers than the prior two times. And as Ms. Dory
7 indicated, some of the answers we were able to refine the
8 answer to give more specific answers to the questions that
9 had previously been given --

10 THE COURT: It's usually pretty self- -- it's
11 usually pretty obvious for the people involved when an answer
12 to a request to admit is a weasely answer or an evasive
13 answer.

14 It's usually yes, no, or we don't have enough
15 information to give you an answer one way or the other.

16 I don't know what -- I don't have the 15 or so in
17 front of me. So I don't --

18 MS. DORY: Yes, and I'll give you one example.

19 Okay? And that is that we asked Waterside whether they knew
20 in 2013 when Building 12 was demolished, and that was --
21 materials in that building were taken to Veterans Field,
22 whether they knew in 2013 when that building was demolished
23 and crushed, that the building was contaminated with PCBs.

24 And the answer that we got was that they knew that
25 there was some contamination in Building 12. And they're not

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

28

1 specifying whether they knew in 2013 when this was demolished
2 that it was contaminated with PCBs. And that's a key --
3 those are key facts in the litigation. And, you know, we can
4 certainly --

5 MR. SHAFRON: What number -- what number question?
6 What number request to admit is that?

7 THE COURT: And that seems to be a yes or.

8 I mean, you -- I guess you could answer it, we knew
9 it was contaminated, but we didn't know specifically it was
10 PCBs. Or we knew it was PCBs. Or we didn't know that it was
11 contaminated at all. And --

12 MR. SHAFRON: I mean, these words have been thrown
13 around in this case very loosely about what it means to be
14 contaminated, what it means to be -- whether it's less than
15 50 parts per million, whether it's more than 50 parts per
16 million, whether it's unsafe, whether it's -- I mean, there
17 is -- and so I just want to look to see what our answer was
18 to that.

19 MS. DORY: Sure. It's Request to Admit Number 45.
20 And there's some objections in the beginning. But it says,
21 Waterside admits certain portions of the building contained
22 contamination. And then there's some further language about
23 how they thought that the actions they took were authorized.

24 But we're asking them, did you know in 2013 when
25 you demolished the building that it was contaminated with

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

29

1 PCBs.

2 MR. SHAFRON: I mean, that's a perfect example. I
3 think Ms. Dory has pointed out an excellent example of how
4 we've gone back to look at these answers, and we've given
5 more specific answers, and we've given a very specific answer
6 now to the question. The question was -- and now we said
7 Waterside admits that certain portions of Building 12
8 contained contamination. I mean what -- we've now
9 admitted --

10 THE COURT: Contamination with PCBs?

11 MR. CORRISTON: We don't know, Judge. We don't
12 know. That's the game they're playing. Yes. No. That's an
13 admission.

14 MS. DORY: There's several more things --

15 MR. SHAFRON: Right, so I --

16 THE COURT: Well, I'll tell you what, I -- I don't
17 have -- I mean, you can attach -- some of them that have been
18 attached to the letter.

19 But what I would like you to do with respect --
20 well, let's hold off on the requests to admit for a second.
21 I'll deal with them last.

22 But how about the other -- the other three things.
23 They're a little more straightforward. You know, the names
24 of the -- the names and the contact information of the folks
25 that were working there and the payroll records.

1 You say that you've given the names, and you're
2 willing to produce the people. Why not just give the contact
3 information, let them subpoena the people?

4 MR. SHAFRON: Well, I -- the people that we've
5 identified, somebody this week at deposition is named, which
6 is the Spiegal [phonetic] person. He's an employee. So
7 we're going to produce him for deposition.

8 So I mean, I assume that's why they want this
9 information is so that they can identify him for deposition.
10 Well, if they're employees, we'll produce them. I mean, we
11 haven't -- we've never say that somebody who's identified, we
12 are not going to produce. And, in fact, I think there's a
13 few people who are former employees that we have contact
14 with --

15 (Simultaneous conversation)

16 THE COURT: Well, Ms. Dory, is it enough that they
17 will produce them for deposition? Or you want the contact
18 information?

19 MS. DORY: Well, we want to know all the people
20 that moved the dirty dirt that ended up at Veterans Field.
21 And he's identified one person. And there's more than one
22 person. We gave them photographs. So that's -- that is one
23 part of it.

24 And then I mean, the other part of it is --

25 MR. CORRISTON: Yeah, I just wanted to add,

1 Your Honor, the deposition that we took the other day, the
2 individual said, these computerized records -- I asked him
3 about the laborers, everybody was working, he said they all
4 turn in cards, goes to the foreman, it's all computerized.
5 It's all available.

6 And we're here where we have this, you know, very
7 noticeable gap for the relevant time period during this
8 period when they acknowledge transferring the material from
9 Building 12 to the field, including one of the key issues is
10 this --

11 THE COURT: What's that time period?

12 MR. CORRISTON: Well, they're -- it's really sort
13 of August to October of 2013. Now, see, there's also a
14 distinction here, Your Honor. They admit that they were
15 bringing this concrete aggregate material, which they claimed
16 they didn't know contained PCBs in it, there was
17 environmental reports going back to 1997 showing it's full of
18 PCBs, which they had possession of. Went on into the parking
19 lots and paved areas.

20 One of the areas of dispute is the field itself.
21 We have a photograph -- this whole thing, the reason -- the
22 only reason they got caught is that Mr. Menzela [phonetic]
23 who worked for -- was driving home on a Saturday, when he was
24 told they weren't working and said, What's going on? And he
25 noticed the concrete aggregate on the field.

1 The witness the other day who wasn't there but was
2 the director of operations, said we put it under the parking
3 lot areas only because Terms approved it, which is disputed,
4 and says, I don't know if it went on the field. I don't know
5 where it went. I can't say one way or the other.

6 Well, we have a photograph of three individuals
7 there spreading the material on the field. We finally get
8 Pilo's name, which --

9 THE COURT: No, I think I understand. You don't
10 need to -- you know, give me chapter and verse of the case.

11 What you're getting at is you think there were a
12 lot of people there in this relevant time period. You want
13 to know their names, and you want to have their contact
14 information.

15 MR. CORRISTON: Right. And it's two places,
16 Your Honor. It's both at the field and then at the source,
17 where it came from.

18 THE COURT: And I had mentioned that -- that those
19 people traveled back and forth from the field -- between
20 those two places. Right?

21 MR. CORRISTON: We're not sure exactly how they do,
22 but they could have ordered somebody put it on the truck, the
23 truck went to the site, and then the guys were spreading it.

24 THE COURT: Mr. Shafron, that seems pretty
25 straightforward?

1 MR. SHAFRON: It does, Your Honor. We -- and my
2 understanding is we provided the names of all the people who
3 have worked in the area on that project.

4 THE COURT: From your understanding, you're the
5 lawyer and should be better than an understanding, you've
6 either done it or you haven't doesn't it. Right?

7 MR. SHAFRON: We've -- there's -- we've sent a
8 letter indicating eight people and some -- and as a result of
9 that letter, deposition notices have been sent by the
10 plaintiff for the deposition of those people.

11 THE COURT: So they're telling me you've identified
12 Pilo. You're telling me you identified eight people.
13 What's -- where's the reality?

14 MR. CORRISTON: I have a letter of January 27th,
15 2017, identifying Pilo. I don't have anyone else.

16 And I'd like to see the records. I want to know
17 who -- I want to know what the records show too so I can
18 verify.

19 THE COURT: I mean that's the next -- the payroll
20 records. I mean, you give the payroll records, we'll know
21 who they are, quite frankly. It may not include the contact
22 information, but it'll tell us who all these people are.

23 So why -- why haven't we produced -- and you want
24 payroll records. I mean, you were talking about all sorts of
25 months in January, but is it sufficient to go August to

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

34

1 October?

2 MR. CORRISTON: Yes, Your Honor. Is it?

3 MS. DORY: Well, the building, I think, was
4 demolished a little bit later --

5 MR. CORRISTON: It was demolished on June 30th, so
6 July -- well --

7 MS. DORY: We asked for April.

8 (Simultaneous conversation)

9 THE COURT: Late June to -- late June to late
10 October?

11 MR. CORRISTON: We asked from April. We'll be
12 satisfied with June through October.

13 THE COURT: All right. So, Mr. Shafron, that's --
14 I mean, what possible argument could made that that stuff is
15 not relevant? And --

16 MR. SHAFRON: No, we --

17 THE COURT: -- what legal argument could be made
18 that it shouldn't be produced.

19 MR. SHAFRON: It's clearly relevant, Your Honor.
20 But we -- we never disputed whether information about a --
21 who was there, it's not relevant. So that certainly is.

22 All right. So to the extent -- because he did
23 testify that there were -- there were payroll records, or
24 that he inputted payroll in 2013. So those records, I
25 assume, those records --

1 THE COURT: Sounds like they might be confused or
2 it might not even be a heavy lift for --

3 MR. SHAFRON: --

4 MR. CORRISTON: He did testify they were
5 computerized.

6 By way of example, again, Your Honor, I should be
7 quiet when I'm winning, but he couldn't identify the two
8 people in the photo. So we asked him too. He couldn't
9 identify them.

10 MR. SHAFRON: And, Your Honor, I will tell you,
11 because I was part of the internal investigation in order to
12 answer their concerns, I mean we asked people. We showed
13 them the photos that they sent and said, Who are these
14 people? And then we -- and I said, these are simple requests
15 that they're asking, who are they. And we don't know.

16 By the way, I did find the letter -- Zach found the
17 letter, it was in January 6th, 2017, to Mr. Corriston, and we
18 said in trying to answer these responses, and we said that --
19 we named the people.

20 We said in response to your question "who performed
21 the work at Veterans Field?" and we said Porfilio Manuel, Bob
22 Rambone [phonetic], Thomas Finn [phonetic], Phillip --
23 Schiller, Pedro Suo [phonetic], Antonio Vasolanos [phonetic],
24 Sparkman Vegas [phonetic], Zachary Daibes, Tom Pellegrino
25 [phonetic], and Sylvester Cordoba [phonetic]. That was -- we

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

36

1 had found that those were the people. And they've sent that
2 notice to some of those people.

3 And so -- and then we said, we'll contact every one
4 of those people and make them available for deposition except
5 for Sylvester Cordoba. He's no longer --

6 THE COURT: Now, do you need their contact
7 information? Or is it enough that they've given you the
8 names and they're going to produce them for deposition?

9 MS. DORY: Well, we -- it would be enough if they'd
10 be produced for a deposition with the exception of the one
11 person, I think, that they couldn't produce.

12 But the issue, just so Your Honor understands, is
13 in that letter, there wasn't confirmation of whether these
14 individuals actually were involved in spreading the
15 materials. So that was part of the problem.

16 And there is, there was actually applications made
17 by Waterside, every time they wanted payment from the
18 Borough, they had to produce an application with all their
19 backup materials. And they produced all of the applications
20 for payment with backup for the entire time period except for
21 this one application which is the relevant time period in the
22 litigation.

23 So in addition to the payroll records, we're also
24 looking for any other documents associated with that payment
25 application that covers the relevant time period.

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

37

1 THE COURT: All right. Let's see. Payroll records
2 from June of '13 to October of '13. Applications for payment
3 for what -- when would it be? September? Or in that period?

4 MS. DORY: Yes, I believe it's Application
5 Number 11. I'll have to confirm it.

6 MR. CORRISTON: 10 and 11 both don't have any
7 information.

8 MS. DORY: 10 and 11.

9 THE COURT: All right. And -- address of the one
10 person you can't produce.

11 MR. SHAFRON: I think we asked -- we did ask, but
12 they didn't have any information on that individual,
13 Your Honor, what -- we said we need the last address for
14 them, and --

15 (Simultaneous conversation)

16 THE COURT: Well, then confirm that in writing to
17 Mr. Corriston and Ms. Dory, and --

18 MR. SHAFRON: I will do that.

19 THE COURT: -- and I guess you're on your way
20 trying to find this guy, if you need to.

21 MR. CORRISTON: And, Your Honor, just in
22 particular, I want to make sure that I'm not limiting this,
23 but I want to make sure that we get September 7th, who was
24 working at both those sites for the company that --

25 MR. SHAFRON: To the extent that that's able to be

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

38

1 determined from the payroll records or from individuals who
2 are going to testify, I mean I think that questions were
3 asked of the supervisor, project manager of this project this
4 week and he was unable to identify those individuals.

5 I -- if they're able to be determined from these
6 other requests that they're asking, then we're certainly
7 happy to provide that information. But --

8 THE COURT: Now, with respect to the requests -- so
9 we have it straight, you're going to tell them who was on the
10 job, if you can on September 7th. You're going to provide
11 those payroll records for a period of about five months.
12 You're going to provide the application for payment Number 10
13 and Number 11. And you're going to give the address of the
14 one person that you cannot produce. You've already
15 identified the other people that you think have been -- or
16 were working during the period of time in question.

17 The only other --

18 MR. CORRISTON: I'm sorry, Your Honor. One
19 clarification, just on September 7th, just so it's not
20 limited, we want to know who was working at the Alcoa site,
21 who was driving the trucks from the Alcoa site to the field,
22 which we have reports, there were actual complaints because
23 there were so many trucks going back and forth. And then who
24 worked actually on the field on that day. Thank you.

25 THE COURT: That's a clarification. I think that

1 was -- and produce the information. But that's fine.

2 With respect to the requests for admissions, I want
3 you to meet and confer and not by letter. So I want you to
4 talk about them on the phone. If you cannot work -- and the
5 one that we actually discussed, I think we can get a little
6 more specific with the answer to that one.

7 If after you actually met and conferred on the
8 phone or in person and talked about these things, there are
9 requests for admission that remain, you know, unsatisfactory
10 to the plaintiff, the answers to requests for admission that
11 remain unsatisfactory, then I'd like you to send me a joint
12 letter, all right, of five pages or less. I'd like you to do
13 that. I'd like you to take care of that all within two
14 weeks. All right?

15 MS. DORY: Thank you, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: And, frankly, you know, none of this
17 stuff in these letters for Issue 2, I get that the identity
18 of the people, the payroll records, we don't have the problem
19 that we had with respect to the Alcoa where you're going to
20 the IRS and it may take several weeks to get the stuff. It
21 should have been produced. You ought to be able to get your
22 hands on it relatively quickly. So I want that all produced
23 within two weeks too. All right?

24 So I want all of the issues that have emanated from
25 these letters regarding the complaints raised in the

1 plaintiff's letter of January 26th, 2017, that Document 206,
2 I want them dealt with in two weeks. All right?

3 And aside from the requests for admissions, it's
4 all pretty straightforward. I don't need to see you guys
5 again on this. You've got a certain number of people that
6 were working there. We want to know who they were. We've
7 got payroll records. We want to produce them. I -- there's
8 no room to -- here. This ought to be pretty straightforward.

9 So let's get that all done within two weeks.

10 All right. Issue Number 3 are the --

11 MR. SHAFRON: Your Honor?

12 THE COURT: Yes.

13 MR. SHAFRON: I'm trying to move this as fast as I
14 can, but I also want to be in compliance. This is a vacation
15 week coming up this week. And -- but I'm only going to be
16 gone for half the week.

17 THE COURT: Well, I don't want to ruin vacations.
18 I'm very --

19 MR. SHAFRON: And then the week after that, Zach is
20 going to be -- unfortunately, there's a small office -- the
21 two of us, and Zach's on vacation the following week. And
22 currently, we have the deposition of Mr. Daibes scheduled for
23 the 1st and the 2nd.

24 So I want --

25 THE COURT: You've got two vacations in there. How

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

41

1 about four weeks?

2 MR. SHAFRON: Yeah, and I'm going to work -- on
3 payroll records, if they're available, I will try to do those
4 as soon as possible. And the identities are -- we are
5 already know so that those -- those are done. And the only
6 question is more specific about who was working where. And
7 if we're able to produce that, I will -- I want them to have
8 that information before they depose Mr. Daibes, so I'm going
9 to try to endeavor to do that.

10 But anything else, like more specific joint letter
11 on requests for admissions, I just -- being realistic, I
12 just --

13 (Simultaneous conversation)

14 THE COURT: All right. I'll say I'll say four
15 weeks.

16 Ms. Dory?

17 MS. DORY: Well, we had asked for some of this
18 information before Mr. Daibes' deposition, so, you know --

19 THE COURT: Yeah, Mr. Shafron, please use your best
20 efforts to get the stuff, and, you know, I -- to have a
21 deposition held up or to have him redeposed, your client
22 won't be happy about that.

23 MR. SHAFRON: Oh, no. No.

24 THE COURT: And I won't hesitate to have him show
25 up again if you're producing things after his deposition.

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

42

1 MR. SHAFRON: Well, as it is --

2 THE COURT: -- and they have questions about it.

3 MR. SHAFRON: Your Honor, as we stand today, we did
4 schedule the deposition. Right? I offered the dates of the
5 1st and the 2nd. But what we took -- we took two days of
6 Mr. McKnight's deposition, but I didn't -- I still haven't
7 been able to ask a single question.

8 So the -- our codefendant, Mr. Hazen [phonetic] is
9 Alcoa's representative. And they have offered a couple of
10 other dates to finish that deposition, which is now -- those
11 dates are -- the dates offered were Tuesday and Wednesday of
12 next week, which I -- Wednesday and Thursday, which I
13 certainly can't do.

14 And -- but I need to complete Mr. McKnight's
15 deposition before we start Mr. Daibes' deposition.

16 Mr. Daibes is ready to testify. He's not, because
17 I don't -- I don't conduct depositions that way with somebody
18 who's got a direct conflicting issue with me, is I take two
19 days of deposition on key issues. I haven't asked -- I
20 haven't even been able to ask a single question. And then
21 we're going to -- then we're going to have my client in the
22 middle, and then -- and then I get to ask questions of the
23 person who's already -- his deposition has already begun.

24 If I complete -- and, again, if there's somebody
25 who's not -- it's not a conflicting testimony on a key issue

1 in the case, then I don't -- like, for example, Mr. -- who
2 just testified.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: Davaro [phonetic].

4 MR. SHAFRON: Ms. Davaro, we didn't finish
5 Ms. Davaro's dep. I don't think his testimony is going to --
6 if we have to split that up between two different -- I don't
7 think there's any difference.

8 But I don't -- I'm not now going to have
9 Mr. McKnight sit there and listen to all of the testimony. I
10 have to be honest, this is the way it works. You have to
11 listen to all the testimony of Mr. Daibes, and then we're
12 going to finish his deposition. I don't take depositions
13 that --

14 THE COURT: Mr. McKnight's going to sit in on
15 Mr. Daibes' --

16 MR. SHAFRON: No, he's going to read -- he's going
17 to have -- he's going to read the transcript, and he's going
18 to -- I mean, so we get daily -- daily transcripts from that
19 deposition.

20 So the point being is I assume we're going to
21 schedule Mr. McKnight's deposition for the following week,
22 and then Mr. Daibes' deposition shortly thereafter.

23 THE COURT: Well, I don't know that that's a fair
24 assumption.

25 What are we saying with --

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

44

1 MR. WALLER: Your Honor, Michael Waller, again,
2 from K&L Gates.

3 That is not a fair assumption. I have no idea what
4 Mr. McKnight's availability is after next week.

5 We did provide Wednesday and Thursday. We offered
6 that, at any rate. And I'm mystified of this having to
7 complete a deposition before you can begin somebody --
8 somebody else's deposition.

9 And I think inadvertently what was suggested is
10 that somehow there McKnight --

11 THE COURT: Well, we are not mystified --

12 MR. WALLER: -- would change his testimony --

13 (Simultaneous conversation)

14 THE COURT: -- obviously, you don't want
15 somebody -- you know, he doesn't want your guy to have the
16 benefit of his guy's testimony.

17 MR. WALLER: Well, I would prefer --

18 THE COURT: It's not a big mystery.

19 MR. WALLER: If that's the way it works, Judge, I
20 would prefer that they not have my witness's --

21 (Simultaneous conversation)

22 THE COURT: But you're right. You're right. It's
23 just the way scheduling works sometimes. I -- Mr. Shafron, I
24 don't know that -- somebody has to go first. And I don't
25 think that that's a good enough reason to start derailing

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

45

1 depositions.

2 MR. SHAFRON: Oh, no, I certainly don't want to
3 derail any depositions. I just -- when a deposition --
4 especially when a deposition has been started, finish that
5 deposition. And then we do the next depositions. I --
6 and --

7 THE COURT: Well --

8 MR. SHAFRON: -- it's nothing nefarious.

9 (Simultaneous conversation)

10 THE COURT: -- that's just --

11 MR. SHAFRON: I'm not suggesting Mr. McKnight,
12 there's anything improper or nefarious about what reading the
13 transcript from the daily deposition. It's just about --
14 that's just about the way depositions work is that when you
15 have a day of deposition in the middle, I don't schedule
16 depositions that way. I never have.

17 THE COURT: Oh, well -- if they've been scheduled,
18 let's get them done.

19 MR. SHAFRON: I'm going to try to do that.

20 THE COURT: We're not going to start posturing
21 about who goes first, who goes second, and trying to get
22 comparative --

23 MR. SHAFRON: Right, and I --

24 THE COURT: Otherwise, every case I have would be a
25 headache like that, and I'm not going to do that.

1 MS. DORY: I just wanted to clarify, you said four
2 weeks from today, if we hadn't resolved our requests to
3 admit. And would that also be the deadline to submit a joint
4 submission?

5 THE COURT: Yeah, I'd like you to do the -- I mean,
6 I want you to have the meet-and-confer as soon as you can. I
7 would expect a letter to me within four weeks.

8 MS. DORY: That we hadn't resolved it. And then a
9 joint submission also at that date?

10 THE COURT: And make that submission -- try to keep
11 it five pages or less. I mean, if you -- if you feel you
12 need more than that, fine. But, you know, all I need to know
13 is here's the requests for admissions, and here's a short
14 blurb on why I think the answers are either inadequate or
15 adequate. And hopefully you can keep that reasonably
16 manageable. All right?

17 MS. DORY: Thank you, Your Honor.

18 THE COURT: Okay.

19 MR. SHAFRON: It may very well be, Your Honor, that
20 some of these questions, we're going to sit and ask these
21 questions at 30(b)(6) depositions which are coming up. And
22 before that, they will be satisfied with whatever answers
23 that they're going to get at deposition.

24 THE COURT: And you're going to meet and confer. I
25 mean -- and work this out.

1 MR. SHAFRON: First thing --

2 (Simultaneous conversation)

3 THE COURT: All right. Moving on to number three
4 are our packet of letters, our third packet of letters. I
5 have a letter from the Alcoa defendants, dated February 14th,
6 2017, just three days ago. Document 20 -- 216.

7 MALE SPEAKER: Happy Valentine's Day, Your Honor.

8 THE COURT: And I have a letter from the Daibes
9 defendants dated February 16th, 2017, and that's
10 Document Number 220.

11 Now, in the Alcoa letter, Alcoa says that they've
12 served requests for written for discovery 40 days ago upon
13 the Daibes defendants; I guess interrogatories, requests for
14 admissions, and document requests.

15 MR. SHAFRON: We're combined into one document.

16 THE COURT: All right. And now you're asking to
17 have things admitted -- deemed admitted and directing answers
18 and whatnot.

19 And the Daibes defendants essentially say, hey,
20 look, we've been doing written discovery forever and ever,
21 and now these are thrown at us in January of 2017. It's well
22 past the time for -- the time set by the Court for service of
23 interrogatories.

24 I understand requests for documents, you know, they
25 kind of come at any time, particularly if they arise out of a

1 discovery during a deposition. And you've got requests for
2 admissions.

3 Ms. Parker, I guess the first thing -- why more
4 interrogatories? I mean usually we have interrogatories --

5 MS. PARKER: Absolutely.

6 THE COURT: -- at the beginning. You have 25, and
7 you're done.

8 MS. PARKER: Absolutely, Your Honor. Just to give
9 you some background, Judge --

10 MR. SHAFRON: I think they were requests for
11 admit -- they're interrogatories too?

12 MS. PARKER: They're interrogatory -- there was one
13 document, and it's combined. But just -- but just to give
14 you some background, Judge Vazquez had issued his opinion on
15 our motion for judgment on the pleadings. By virtue of his
16 opinion, there were suggestions or certain issues that he
17 raised that could potentially be dispositive for Alcoa and
18 certain factual issues that we needed to establish for that
19 claim -- our claims to succeed.

20 When that opinion came out, we then posed these
21 discovery requests on the Daibes defendants.

22 It was our understanding, pursuant to your
23 December 2006 order, that the fact discovery deadline in this
24 case was extended till the end of February, which was why we
25 thought it was appropriate from a timing perspective to serve

1 these.

2 THE COURT: And it's probably going to get extended
3 again.

4 No, I ask only specifically with respect to the
5 interrogatories.

6 MS. PARKER: Yeah, which really more actually -- to
7 be honest with you, it's really actually only -- the document
8 itself is a request to admit. And if in the end -- and we
9 phrased it, if you're denying this request, provide an
10 explanation.

11 So it's a -- so formally, is it a really a request
12 to admit? Yes. But we labeled it combined, because there
13 was a subpart in that that said, if you're going to deny
14 this, we'd like an explanation and produce a document that
15 says otherwise.

16 THE COURT: All right.

17 MS. PARKER: So it was -- I mean, if you want to
18 call it a request to admit, it was a request to admit with
19 subparts.

20 THE COURT: All right. Now, Mr. Shafron, I
21 understand your -- why you at least balked at first. And I'm
22 not going to deem that you think it's admitted right now.

23 But why -- you know, it sounds like they had a
24 good-faith reason for asking. And I think certainly can
25 propound requests for admission and additional requests for

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

50

1 production as we go along. Maybe that will obviate some
2 deposition testimony or at least shorten up some deposition
3 testimony.

4 Given what you've just heard, are you still
5 resistant to answering these? Or if I give you a certain
6 amount time to answer them, will you go ahead and do it?

7 MR. SHAFRON: Well, first of all, that wasn't my
8 understanding, Your Honor. I didn't know that written
9 discovery and requests for admit -- and if they're calling
10 them interrogatories, interrogatories -- I thought the
11 factual discovery deadline that you extended was about
12 take -- about depositions. I didn't know that we're now
13 serving new requests for admits now. And --

14 THE COURT: Requests for admissions come -- they're
15 an unusual bird in the discovery -- in the world of
16 discovery, and they, I find, come at any time.

17 Requests for production are the same way. You
18 know, you might find something out during discovery. You
19 send out a subpoena or you -- you know, do requests for
20 production following up on deposition testimony, which
21 somebody revealed that documents exists nobody really knew
22 before.

23 So those two -- that's why I focus on the
24 interrogatories. Interrogatories are something I very much
25 expect to be done with at the very beginning of discovery and

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

51

1 | not revisit them.

2 | But to the extent Ms. Parker's explained these are
3 | really requests for admission, and if you're going to deny,
4 | you know, why.

5 | MR. SHAFRON: Well, then, Your Honor, if
6 | Your Honor's inclined to allow these requests for admit, we
7 | would answer requests to admit, but I'm not answering them in
8 | the way -- I respectfully request to not be required to
9 | answer in the way that they were presented. I actually
10 | didn't even realize they were presented that way that they're
11 | sort of like a hybrid between requests to admit and
12 | interrogatories -- that now I have to admit or deny and then
13 | give a big long explanation and as to why it is we -- we
14 | either admit or deny or explain why we can't admit or deny.
15 | Or admit to the part that we can admit and deny the remaining
16 | part.

17 | I'm loathe to do that, Your Honor, at this point.

18 | MS. PARKER: Your Honor, may I approach and just
19 | show you what this document is, because you'll understand
20 | what I was saying.

21 | THE COURT: How many did we have?

22 | MS. PARKER: Is it -- now -- you have the number.
23 | I don't -- look at the end of that document.

24 | (Simultaneous conversation)

25 | THE COURT: Yeah -- it's 10. Right?

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

52

1 MS. PARKER: Yeah. It's not a lot.

2 THE COURT: So that's not....

3 I certainly don't have any problem with the
4 requests for admissions. The follow-up stuff looks
5 perilously close to a reopening of all written discovery,
6 and -- I'm on the fence right now.

7 MS. PARKER: And, you know, as I said to
8 Your Honor, the reason these were very carefully crafted to
9 sort of mirror Judge Vazquez's opinion. And that's why we --
10 we're trying to save time in depositions and down the road.

11 MR. SHAFRON: And, Your Honor, and since we're on
12 the record on this issue, I have to disagree with
13 Ms. Parker's characterization that there was something in
14 Judge Vazquez's decision which was new to the Alcoa
15 defendants and that now there's an entirely new area of
16 factual inquiry that they're interested in that they couldn't
17 have been or shouldn't have been aware of when this whole
18 entire matter was briefed and argued in front of Judge
19 Vazquez.

20 I -- whether or not Your Honor's considering
21 requiring us to answer requests for admissions, either way, I
22 think I just better put it on the record that I certainly
23 don't agree with that characterization, that there's
24 something new that occurred there.

25 And by the way, I should put on the record that all

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

53

1 the characterizations of the plaintiff about what's happened
2 to this case, I haven't argued with. But we're only at a --
3 we're only at a discovery conference.

4 But I just want to make sure that there is not some
5 tacit understanding or agreement that by me not saying
6 anything, that I agree with that characterization. I
7 certainly do not.

8 And if Your Honor is going -- we didn't serve any
9 further requests for admit because we thought the time for
10 that was over. If we're -- if we're in that mode of serving
11 new requests for admissions, we would certainly -- then we
12 would be entitled to serve new requests for admit as well, I
13 would assume.

14 So --

15 THE COURT: If you are serving less than 30 -- or
16 more than 30 days before the end of discovery, I'm inclined
17 to allow you to do that.

18 MR. SHAFRON: Thank you.

19 THE COURT: I'm allowing everybody else to do it,
20 so --

21 MR. SHAFRON: Thank you.

22 THE COURT: But let's not go hog-wild.

23 10 is not so bad. I don't want to hear, you know,
24 that we sent out 500 tomorrow.

25 MR. SHAFRON: We should be -- we're not at 500, by

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

54

1 no means --

2 THE COURT: Ms. Parker, the only thing this doesn't
3 anticipate, suppose the answer is we don't have sufficient
4 facts to either admit or deny?

5 MS. PARKER: Well, then they can write that in the
6 answer below. Right? There is a space.

7 THE COURT: Okay. You know, Mr. Shafron, it's
8 only -- it's 10 -- they do seem to be carefully crafted. I'm
9 going to -- as drafted, I'm going to direct you to answer
10 these. But you can answer them -- can you do it within that
11 28-day period that I set for everything else?

12 MR. SHAFRON: Yes, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Let's answer these
14 10 in the next -- in the next four weeks.

15 All right. That takes care of Issue Number 3.

16 And the last issue was raised in the letter from
17 the plaintiffs, sent on Valentine's Day, Document 217. I
18 received a response from the Alcoa defendants the very next
19 day. That's Document 218. And then I got a letter from the
20 plaintiffs yesterday, the 16th of February, and that's
21 Document 221.

22 The plaintiff's letter says that a Keith McKnight,
23 a fact witness and a 30(b)(6) witness for Alcoa was recently
24 deposed. And he took the position at the deposition that
25 Alcoa doesn't really know if they're -- if Alcoa used PCBs at

1 the site in question.

2 Now, the plaintiff is concerned about that because
3 they had thought it was rather clear that PCBs had been --
4 that it was understood that PCBs have been present and/or
5 used at the site for years prior to 1997 and that this Amland
6 suit and the subsequent settlement of it will be sure
7 evidence of that being the case. And they want discovery
8 with respect to all that, if Alcoa's position is going to be
9 that we don't know whether PCBs were used at the site.

10 Alcoa responded by saying, gee, we just received
11 word of this. We really are not ready to deal with it. We
12 haven't even had a chance to have a meet and confer. Let's
13 not talk about it today.

14 And the -- which I understand. I mean, this is
15 getting the letter two days ago on something so important is
16 kind of a small window.

17 And then the plaintiff said, hey, we've been -- in
18 their last letter, said we've been talking about this for a
19 long time. We would at least like to chat about it at the
20 conference and see if we can't get some sort of guidance.

21 I guess the question for Ms. Parker is --

22 MS. PARKER: He's going to handle this one.

23 THE COURT: Well, is that the official position of
24 Alcoa that they -- that they don't know whether PCBs were
25 used at the spot? It does -- and maybe you're not ready to

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

56

1 talk about it today, and I understand that. But it does
2 raise a kind of a grim prospect of this litigation becoming
3 five times as big as it is right now.

4 MR. WALLER: There is --

5 THE COURT: And reopen all of that Amland
6 litigation, everything --

7 MR. WALLER: No, no, I can say this, Your Honor.
8 And Mr. Corriston referenced it earlier, we have produced and
9 other parties have produced numerous environmental reports
10 that establish that there was environmental contamination at
11 the site, one, when Alcoa reacquired the property in '91, and
12 when it was sold in '97. There is no issue that in '97 when
13 the property was sold to the Daibes defendants, that there
14 was PCB contamination in the concrete in the buildings.

15 We -- one of the reports that we produced had a
16 color chart that actually plotted all the environment -- the
17 PCB contamination per floor per building.

18 THE COURT: But you're a defendant here. And if
19 you're going to take the position, well, there was
20 contamination there, but we're still not sure who was
21 responsible for it, da, da, da, then that sounds like
22 we're -- we're going to relitigate things that from -- and
23 just tell me. If we're going to, we're going to. But God
24 help us if --

25 MR. WALLER: Well, I don't know yet, Your Honor. I

1 don't -- you know, and I think that's part of what I want --
2 and we had just a very quick conversation with Mr. Corriston
3 the other day. I thought it was a good start. We can
4 continue on -- he kind of outlined a little bit of kind of
5 what they need. And to be honest, my contact is out with
6 pneumonia.

7 THE COURT: All right.

8 MR. WALLER: So there wasn't really much I could
9 do.

10 THE COURT: No, I understand.

11 MR. WALLER: And I can't --

12 THE COURT: I just don't --

13 MR. WALLER: And Mr. McKnight testified that, yes,
14 there were PCB-containing transformers on the site. There
15 was an affidavit that was -- that was actually produced by
16 Edgewater from the -- they've gotten some files from the
17 Amland litigation where a guy said, yes, they were there.
18 The place was clean and -- but yet they were found open, and
19 the copper had been pulled out them sometime before or
20 around -- you know, sometime before it was sold to the Daibes
21 defendants. All that is out there. So in terms of the
22 contamination and it being there in '91 and '97, that's not
23 an issue.

24 But beyond that as to where Mr. Corriston needs to
25 go -- and, again, we just started that conversation

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

58

1 yesterday, and whatnot, you know, I think it needs to be
2 explored a little bit.

3 THE COURT: It may not be something that's very
4 easy to solve, but, boy, it's going to multiply the tasks and
5 the discovery in this case like a hydrogen bomb, I think.

6 MR. CORRISTON: Yeah, and let me just explain
7 something also. The period before '97, this facility shut
8 down in 1965. It was sold to other people. There was --
9 then there's two defendants here. There's Alcoa Domestic,
10 which took title in '97. Then there's the other Alcoa which
11 operated this facility. And quite frankly, you know, I was
12 shocked, because you have to realize Alcoa paid the people
13 who owned the facility -- who they purchased it back from \$15
14 million and knowing that the environmental report said it was
15 \$25 million to clean it up, the PCBs, and now we get a
16 witness saying, well, I'm not sure we did it. So --

17 THE COURT: No, I understand and --

18 MR. CORRISTON: And also, Your Honor, Judge Barry's
19 decision cites the fact that -- and we need some candor with
20 the Court and I realize they need time, cites the fact that
21 Alcoa admitted it used PCB hydraulic fluids at the facility.
22 They actually had -- we have a memo from 1956 saying that
23 there were 14 processes at the facility where they used PCB
24 hydraulics. This building was the aluminum mill, full of
25 machinery.

1 So one of the things I said to Mr. Waller, I said,
2 Look, if you're going to make me jump through the hoops, I'm
3 going to jump through the hoops.

4 I said, but if Mr. McKnight is not the appropriate
5 witness, someone must have some historical knowledge of the
6 processes that Alcoa used in making aluminum. It wasn't that
7 different. They have no less than three Superfund sites and
8 five sites I identified on the Internet with extensive PCB
9 contamination from waste oils used in their processes --

10 MR. WALLER: Irrelevant, prejudicial. It's not
11 coming in at trial. You know, the rest of it, we can talk
12 about.

13 THE COURT: No, no, no, I --

14 (Simultaneous conversation)

15 MR. CORRISTON: I don't think we're at trial.

16 But, Your Honor, the point is we -- and I
17 realize -- I'm willing to give them some time, but we need to
18 know which fork we're going down.

19 THE COURT: No, I agree. We do need to -- we need
20 to know at some point whether Alcoa's going to say, yeah, we
21 were the source of any PCBs that were at the site, or, gee,
22 we don't think we were. I mean, if you take that position,
23 "gee, we don't think we were," I see this litigation becoming
24 a lot more --

25 MR. CORRISTON: Another pointed, Your Honor,

1 remember, they wouldn't give us the Amland stuff. I had to
2 go to New York and get what I could, and we're still trying
3 to get some of the documents, because we don't have the
4 exhibits. That was this issue.

5 In fact, they filed a third-party complaint to get
6 Monsanto, because they didn't warn them that PCB hydraulic
7 fluids were dangerous and could cause contamination.

8 THE COURT: But, Mr. Corriston, you don't have to --
9 I mean, I appreciate your presentation, but I understand. If
10 Alcoa is going to take the position that we don't know the
11 source of the PCBs at this site, then you're going to have to
12 get a lot of this discovery, I would think, I mean, I'll have
13 to -- I'll have to take each dispute as it comes, but it
14 wouldn't surprise me that you would want this discovery and
15 that you might, in fact, be entitled to an awful lot of it.
16 And.

17 MR. WALLER: Your Honor, I'm not sure we're there
18 yet, but I would ask the Court keep an open mind as to, given
19 the claims in this case and given the fact that there's no
20 dispute that it was there, Alcoa owned the property at the
21 time it was sold, and given plaintiff's claims, I'm not
22 sure -- you know, I'm not there yet, to what extent this
23 really so relevant.

24 And we may be there. I don't know. I'd like to
25 see if the -- maybe it would help -- maybe with my client,

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

61

1 for example, if Mr. Corriston can share the memo he has with
2 me. Standing --

3 THE COURT: You're not sure how relevant it is that
4 there are PCBs at the site?

5 MR. WALLER: No, that --

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- caused them.

7 MR. WALLER: -- but as to -- if they were there, if
8 there was contamination there, we're not disputing that at
9 all when Alcoa reacquired in '91 and sold it in '97 --

10 THE COURT: Well, I guess it wouldn't be -- I guess
11 it wouldn't be relevant --

12 MR. WALLER: For CERCLA purposes.

13 THE COURT: -- if you, as owner of the property --
14 strictly liable for the presence of PCBs, yeah, then, who
15 really cares? But I don't know that that's the case.

16 MR. WALLER: That's what I'm saying, we may not be
17 there yet.

18 THE COURT: -- you disabuse me of that notion.

19 MR. WALLER: Your Honor, we may not be there.

20 THE COURT: Okay. All right.

21 MR. CORRISTON: The memo I referred to is
22 absolutely referenced in their -- Mr. McKnight referenced in
23 his own deposition, they have --

24 MR. WALLER: Oh, that was the one? Okay.

25 MR. CORRISTON: But, Your Honor, it's -- it's

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

62

1 important because, again, we need to separate Alcoa Domestic
2 and Alcoa because Alcoa is claiming that they did not cause
3 any of this concrete to be contaminated, and that's their
4 defense. And that's fine when -- if that's their deference,
5 we're entitled to discovery.

6 THE COURT: Well, is that -- I mean, I am not --
7 you're not sure that that's your defense right now. Is that
8 right?

9 MR. WALLER: Yeah, that's -- that's correct. I
10 don't mean -- again, under the CERCLA claims, I'm not sure
11 any of this is -- really matters. But we're more than
12 willing to talk to Mr. Corriston about it.

13 THE COURT: All right. Well, I guess it -- the
14 final -- do any of our extra defendants have anything to add
15 to --

16 MS. PARKER: They're so patient.

17 MR. CORRISTON: Do we have a time period in which
18 we have to report back to the Court on this issue as to
19 whether -- we're going to meet-and-confer. Obviously, you
20 have to talk to your client.

21 THE COURT: Can you let me know by the end of
22 March?

23 MR. CORRISTON: That is fine, because one of the
24 issues I did raise -- and I just -- I said, look, I don't
25 have -- I'm going to have to call Mr. McKnight back if we

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

63

1 continue before I get this production, unless it -- it --
2 maybe there's another witness, so I don't really care. So
3 that's one of the issues I said, if there's another witness,
4 I'm fine continuing with him and not calling him back. But I
5 just want to make it clear that I'm reserving my right that
6 at some point, I'm going to need someone with knowledge on
7 this, if we can't work it out amongst ourselves.

8 THE COURT: All right. So let us know by letter by
9 the end of March what the upshot of your back and forth is.

10 MR. SHAFRON: Thank you, Your Honor. And I just --

11 MR. CORRISTON: Oh, I'm sorry, one more issue.

12 Excuse me. We learned during the deposition of Mr. McKnight
13 that Alcoa is no longer Alcoa. The company was split in two.
14 So we're going to need -- we're going to have talk about
15 that. I'm just raising the issue, we may have to file an
16 amended pleading.

17 THE COURT: An amended? Okay. You probably
18 wouldn't have a problem with that.

19 MR. WALLER: Not at all, Your Honor.

20 MR. CORRISTON: My one concern that you may or may
21 not have a problem with was Mr. McKnight testified the
22 company was split in two and that he believed that the
23 company that would be liable for any liability attributed in
24 this case is Alconic [phonetic].

25 MR. WALLER: That's correct.

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

64

1 MR. CORRISTON: I'm fine as long as I get that
2 representation, and if there's some reason it later proves
3 incorrect, I don't want someone saying, oh, you blew the
4 statute of limitations or something like that. So if we
5 could just -- I don't want to sue anybody --

6 (Simultaneous conversation)

7 MR. WALLER: No, no, it will not be a problem.

8 THE COURT: -- protect yourself. I --

9 MR. CORRISTON: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll work
10 it out with Mr. Waller.

11 MR. WALLER: Definitely.

12 THE COURT: All right.

13 MR. CORRISTON: Sorry, Jason.

14 MR. SHAFRON: Your Honor, there's just one more
15 issue, and it wasn't raised in the letter, but we have to --
16 my chance to depose Mr. McKnight is coming up, hopefully
17 soon, depending on when we --

18 MR. WALLER: Next week.

19 MR. SHAFRON: -- dates, I can't do it. I have
20 court all day on Thursday, I can't do that.

21 But I'm reviewing the history of the dispute that
22 we have with Alcoa on probably the most crucial issue in the
23 case as it relates to my clients and Alcoa. And I don't know
24 how familiar Your Honor is with all of that. The crucial
25 issue -- at least one of the most crucial issues between us

1 | is that they're claiming indemnity pursuant to a series of --
2 | that they say -- and release one of them, signatory to the
3 | agreement is -- has to indemnify the Alcoa defendants.

4 | Part of our claim is that those -- those
5 | agreements, to the extent that they would be -- if they --
6 | initiated by the fraud that was committed by Alcoa in failing
7 | to disclose to us the existence of two substantial oil tanks
8 | that are under -- that are under Building 12 that we
9 | discovered 2012, 2013 when that building was demolished.

10 | The reason I'm bringing it up now is we've had a
11 | series of letters back and forth in discovery where we asked
12 | for all of the information about what they knew, what Alcoa
13 | knew about, those -- crucial issue. And it obviously is a
14 | crucial issue because it was what was argued in motion
15 | practice in front of Judge Vazquez. It is probably the
16 | central issue that was argued in front of Judge Vazquez about
17 | the extent of the fraud and how that would impact the
18 | enforceability of any agreement.

19 | In response to our request for a whole -- all of
20 | the documents associated with that, we received a response
21 | back, basically to distill it to its essence, none of that
22 | information is relevant. Okay? And then we -- wrote back
23 | that it is. Then the last letter that we received on that
24 | issue, again, and the last letter that I recall receiving on
25 | that issue was a June 29th, 2016, letter, a three-page letter

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

66

1 from Mr. Waller where he, again, at length, attempted to take
2 the position that none of those documents that we're
3 requesting are relevant.

4 Since the time that that occurred -- and they said
5 they had no documents. They said the one documents that we
6 might have had, we sent to you --

7 THE COURT: About -- when they were talking about
8 oil tanks.

9 MR. SHAFRON: The oil tanks. That we sent to
10 you -- since that time, they found documents -- a few
11 documents and produced those to us.

12 MR. WALLER: The documents we produced to your
13 client, which show the tanks. Don't forget that part.

14 MR. SHAFRON: That's the allegation, which, again,
15 I don't want to argue this whole case now, but I -- it's --
16 it's going to be an interesting trial position to take that
17 they knew about these tanks and didn't disclose them to --
18 when they said all the tanks had been removed from the
19 property.

20 But that's for another day.

21 We have Mr. McKnight's deposition. I just want a
22 confirmation today so I don't have to get you on the phone
23 that when I asked -- start asking all of these questions at
24 Mr. McKnight's deposition, they're not going to take the
25 position that none of this information is relevant.

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

67

1 | That --

2 | THE COURT: I mean, relevance isn't a legitimate --

3 | MR. SHAFRON: Right.

4 | THE COURT: I mean --

5 | MR. SHAFRON: Is it likely to lead to admissible
6 | evidence. They still -- their position strikingly, still,
7 | that none of this has anything to do with --

8 | THE COURT: Unless you've got a privilege issue,
9 | don't call me on it --

10 | MR. SHAFRON: I hope not. But if I have --

11 | (Simultaneous conversation)

12 | THE COURT: -- if it's a relevance thing --

13 | (Simultaneous conversation)

14 | MR. SHAFRON: -- Mr. McKnight fly in from
15 | Pittsburgh, I certainly don't want that to be the position
16 | that's asserted at the dep. It is certainly directly
17 | relevant, and if it -- at least likely to lead to admissible
18 | evidence. But I -- but it's directly relevant. It's the
19 | most -- probably the most important issue as it relates --

20 | (Simultaneous conversation)

21 | THE COURT: Which, likely to lead to admissible
22 | isn't the test really anymore.

23 | MR. SHAFRON: What's the test?

24 | THE COURT: Well, it's just kind of a -- it's a
25 | general -- is a relevance test. The amendments at the end of

1 2014 got rid of that.

2 MR. SHAFRON: Oh, I haven't fought it out since
3 then.

4 THE COURT: -- that time-honored -- I was so used
5 to that. It made so much sense to me, but --

6 MR. SHAFRON: Yeah --

7 THE COURT: -- they got rid of that.

8 MR. SHAFRON: So, that's all, Your Honor. I
9 just -- I didn't know whether that -- the Alcoa defendants
10 were continuing to take that position that no -- that
11 knowledge, that information, those documents were not
12 relevant --

13 (Simultaneous conversation)

14 THE COURT: Well, I can tell you if I get a phone
15 call, I'm likely in a situation where somebody's saying it's
16 not relevant -- a deposition is broad, the scope of discovery
17 is broad, I'm going to -- unless there's a privilege issue,
18 I'm -- I would urge you not to fight that one, allow the
19 question to go forward --

20 I think we -- I think it's pretty clear we need to
21 push out the fact discovery deadline.

22 What do you think, the end of May?

23 MR. CORRISTON: I think that's appropriate,
24 Your Honor.

25 THE COURT: Does that make sense? All right. I'll

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

69

1 do that for now.

2 And we'll probably -- we'll probably set a call for
3 sometime around then to see how we're doing, and what -- you
4 know, what we need to do for other deadlines. You guys will
5 probably have things that you bring up to me long before
6 then. I mean, they have a call -- a call may become
7 necessary because of other issues you bring up, but the end
8 of May call will just be our, you know, regularly scheduled
9 case management or making sure we're staying on top of the
10 case kind call.

11 Anything further, Mr. Corriston?

12 MR. CORRISTON: No, Your Honor, just thank you. I
13 would say. The security guards, when I came in, said he's
14 the only one still here. I said, well, either --

15 THE COURT: It's not Memorial Day weekend or --
16 everybody's just getting out of here.

17 MR. CORRISTON: I said he either scheduled this at
18 this time because he was very busy or he wanted to make a
19 point to us.

20 THE COURT: No. It's just -- and I have --
21 although, yeah, Friday, I -- that was probably a trick on my
22 part. So I don't know. Let me just before -- are we done
23 with things for the record?

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, Your Honor. We'll go
25 off the -- we'll go off the record.

|Hearing
|14-cv-05060, February 17, 2017

70

1 | (Conclusion of proceedings at 4:29:33)

2 |

3 |

4 |

5 |

6 |

7 |

8 |

9 |

10 |

11 |

12 |

13 |

14 |

15 |

16 |

17 |

18 |

19 |

20 |

21 |

22 |

23 |

24 |

25 |

